

(Translation)

**Minutes of the 8th Meeting of
Traffic Development and Transport Committee,
the 6th Term Kwun Tong District Council**

Date: 26 January 2023 (Thursday)

Time: 9:34 a.m. – 11:41 a.m.

Venue: Conference Room, Kwun Tong District Office,
Unit 05-07, 20/F, Millennium City 6, 392 Kwun Tong Road,
Kwun Tong, Kowloon

<u>Present</u>	<u>Arrival Time</u>	<u>Leaving Time</u>
Dr NGAN Man-yu (Chairman)	9:34 a.m.	11:41 a.m.
Mr LAM Wai (Vice-chairman)	9:34 a.m.	11:41 a.m.
Mr CHAN Yiu-hung Jimmy, MH	9:34 a.m.	11:41 a.m.
Ms FU Pik-chun, MH	9:34 a.m.	9:50 a.m.
Mr HSU Yau-wai	9:34 a.m.	11:41 a.m.
Mr KAN Ming-tung, MH	9:34 a.m.	11:41 a.m.
Ms LAI Po-kwai	9:34 a.m.	11:41 a.m.
Mr LUI Tung-hai, MH	9:36 a.m.	11:41 a.m.
Mr OR Chong-shing Wilson, MH	9:34 a.m.	11:41 a.m.
Mr PANG Chi-sang	9:34 a.m.	11:41 a.m.
Mr SO Koon-chung Kevin	9:34 a.m.	11:41 a.m.
Ms TSE Suk-chun	9:34 a.m.	11:41 a.m.

In Attendance

Ms CHAN Wai-chun, Regina	Assistant District Officer (Kwun Tong)1
Mr CHOW Lap-kan, Douglas	Senior Executive Officer (District Council), Kwun Tong District Office
Mr LEUNG Pak-fung, Kazaf	Senior Transport Officer/Kwun Tong 1, Transport Department
Mr CHU Cheuk-king	Senior Transport Officer/Kwun Tong 2, Transport Department
Mr LAM Tak, Eric	Engineer/Kwun Tong 1, Transport Department
Mr CHAN Chin-yeung, Edwin	Engineer/Kwun Tong 3, Transport Department

Mr LEONG Man-hin, Jason	District Engineer/Kwun Tong, Highways Department
Mr HO Chi-kin	Officer-in-charge, District Traffic Team (Kwun Tong), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr CHU Chi-wai, Boris	Officer-in-charge, District Traffic Team (Sau Mau Ping), Hong Kong Police Force

Secretary

Miss SUEN Hoi-ping, Heidi	Executive Officer (District Council)(4), Kwun Tong District Office
---------------------------	---

Absent

Mr CHEUNG Pui-kong
Mr LEUNG Tang-fung
Mr TAM Siu-cheuk

Representatives Present to Assist with Discussion of Agenda Items

Agenda Item II

Report on Usage of Footbridge KF142

Mr LEUNG Chi-foon	Chief Engineer/East 2, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr CHEUNG Kwok-ho	Senior Engineer/1 (East), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr LAM Kan-sau	Engineer/9 (East), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr YUEN Chi-lap	Senior Engineer/Transport Services 1 Electrical and Mechanical Services Department
Mr HO Tsz-him, Kenny	Maintenance Engineer/Structure (Kowloon East 1), Highways Department
Mr LEONG Man-hin, Jason	District Engineer/Kwun Tong, Highways Department
Mr CHAN Chin-yeung, Edwin	Engineer/Kwun Tong 3, Transport Department

Agenda Item III

Proposed Pedestrian Environment Improvement Works in Kwun Tong Business Area – Ngau Tau Kok Portion

Mr WONG Chi-sing, Janson	Senior Project Development Manager, Energizing Kowloon East Office
Mr TANG Siu-kit, Rafael	Works Consolidation Manager (3), Energizing Kowloon East Office
Mr WONG Yin-kai, Vincent	Chief Engineer/Works, Highways Department
Mr LAU Chak-hung, Eric	Senior Engineer/Land Sharing Pilot Scheme 1, Highways Department
Mr Tommy CHAN	Associate, ARUP, Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited

Agenda Item IV

Elevator System between Kai Tin Road and Lei Yue Mun Road - Investigation, Design and Construction

Mr MA Kin-yee	Senior Engineer/District Facility, Highways Department
Mr CHAN Ying-lok, Simon	Engineer/District Facility, Highways Department
Mr Martin CHEUNG	Director, Mannings (Asia) Consultants Limited
Mr Aaron KWAN	Project Manager, Mannings (Asia) Consultants Limited
Mr Roger CHEUNG	Graduate Engineer, Mannings (Asia) Consultants Limited

Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed all the attendees to the 8th meeting of the Traffic Development and Transport Committee (“TDTC”) under the 6th Term Kwun Tong District Council (“KTDC”).

2. The Chairman reported that the Secretariat had not received any notice of absence from Members.

I. Confirmation of Minutes of Last Meeting

3. Members raised no other comments. The minutes of the 7th meeting were confirmed.

**II. Report on Usage of Footbridge KF142
(KTDC TDTC Paper No. 2/2023)**

4. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (“CEDD”), Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (“EMSD”), Highways Department (“HyD”) and Transport Department (“TD”) to the meeting.

5. The representatives of CEDD presented the paper.

6. The highlights of the supplementary response given by the representative of TD were as follows:

6.1 TD conducted pedestrian surveys at footbridge KF142 (“KF142”) and another footbridge KF143 (“KF143”) near Yung Tai House in May and November 2022 respectively. It was noted that during the morning peak hours, the pedestrian flow was comprised mainly of students, residents getting to other public facilities in the Sze Shun community and those heading for Shun On Road to take rides. As the two primary schools and the social services complex (including the clinic) near On Tai Estate had not yet been completed, some residents (especially students and parents) might have to pass through KF142 to reach the primary schools and other community facilities downhill. Thus, KF142 was used more frequently by members of the public. TD would review the usage of KF142 having regard to the completion of the social service facilities and schools in On Tai Estate and its surrounding areas.

6.2 In regard to the provision of signage at On Yan Street, TD would provide temporary pedestrian direction signs guiding the public to use KF143 to reach the Sze Shun community and the newly added bus stop, so as to balance the pedestrian flows of the two footbridges.

6.3 TD recommended that an en-route bus stop for cross harbour bus route nos. 619, 619P and 619X bound for Hong Kong Island be provided across from Tin Wan

House, so that residents who got there via KF143 to take buses would have more bus routes to choose from. At present, TD had been striving to implement the new arrangement of provision of an en-route bus stop for the above routes in the first quarter of the year. If the results of the arrangement were satisfactory, TD would not rule out the possibility of providing more bus routes.

7. The representative of EMSD added that EMSD had received a report in January this year from the consultant commissioned by CEDD proposing to change the lifts from the energy saving mode (the present status) to the independent operating mode. The consultant and the lift contractor initially anticipated that it would take 14 days to change the programming of a lift. After further communication with the lift maintenance and programming contractor, EMSD learned that the anticipated time for changing the programming could be shortened to seven to nine days. In addition, it was the first time the contractor would change the programming of this model of lift. In order to avoid any instability, the contractor suggested that the programming changes for the two lifts be scheduled in succession. EMSD would continue to discuss further with other departments and Members of the constituency concerned regarding the details and timetable for enhancing the above proposal.

8. In regard to the agenda item, Members raised views and enquiries as follows:

8.1 Mr PANG Chi-sang (i) enquired whether TD's proposal to add three bus routes of the no. 619 series for the bus stop at Tin Wan House would actually be effective. He pointed out that if most residents using the lifts were headed to schools, any additional bus route would in fact be of little help. He asked whether TD had conducted any survey to collect the commuting data of residents. He opined that TD should review the effectiveness of additional bus routes based on the general direction shown by the data; and (ii) enquired about the reasons why the patronage of KF142 was higher than that of KF143, and why the addition of three bus routes at Tin Wan House could balance the pedestrian flow.

8.2 The Vice-chairman (i) appreciated CEDD for conducting multiple pedestrian surveys at the footbridges in the past two years, as well as the efforts of other departments; (ii) enquired TD about the number of passengers taking cross harbour bus route no. 619 and questioned whether the bus route could attract the patronage of the residents. He pointed out that since bus route no. 619 departed from Shun Lee Estate with an en-route stop in Shun Tin Estate, residents would naturally get on the bus at the earlier stop in Shun Lee Estate; and (iii) added that with the population intake of On Tai Estate, there were chaotic scenes at KF142 due to

queuing problems. Fortunately, some residents, on their own initiative, maintained order on the spot. They did so for half a month before HyD staff drew lines on the ground of the above footbridge for residents to queue up. He said that someone was needed to maintain order on the spot in order to change the queuing habits of the residents. He was pleased to see that TD would adjust the signage to divert the pedestrian flow. However, as residents had to take quite a long walk before reaching KF143 that connected Shun Tin Estate, generally only residents of Yung Tai House and Kam Tai House used KF143 to get to Shun Tin Estate, while residents of Ming Tai House, Wo Tai House and Chi Tai House generally used KF142 to reach Shun On Estate instead of deliberately using KF143 to Shun Tin Estate for taking cross harbour buses. He expressed doubts about the effectiveness of the above diversion measures unless TD set up a bus stop for cross harbour bus route no. 619 in On Tai Estate. In his view, there would be significant discrepancies between TD's current idea and the actual implementation. He opined that TD could divert the pedestrian flow more effectively by establishing cross harbour bus stops in On Tai Estate. He hoped that TD would give it more careful consideration, adding that its proposed addition of bus stop could not change the present situation as residents would not take a detour to the bus stop.

9. The highlights of the response given by the representative of TD were as follows:

- 9.1 Despite the population intake of On Tai Estate in 2017, the two primary schools and the social services complex (including the clinic) near On Tai Estate had not yet been completed. TD had conducted site observations and pedestrian surveys, and found that most of the lift users were students. Among them were students going to schools in Shun Tin and Shun Lee and those who had to commute to schools in other districts. TD understood that the demand for transport services among students was strong. Students mainly took public transport such as buses and minibuses that were headed towards Choi Hung Interchange or Mong Kok. In addition, as there were currently no cross harbour bus routes running between On Yan Street and Central and Western District, residents would also choose to take cross harbour bus route no. 619 on Shun On Road. In the long run, TD was considering adding other bus routes in On Tai Area progressively.
- 9.2 In regard to the effectiveness of the provision of a bus stop at Tin Wan House, TD stated that at present, there were about six residential buildings in On Tai Estate that were closer to KF142. While King Tai House was located in a relatively central position of the estate, it was about the same walking distance to either KF142 or

KF143. Hence, TD planned to install pedestrian direction signs at the corresponding locations to guide residents to use KF143. At present, many residents used KF142 to reach Shun On Road for taking public transport. TD considered that if en-route bus stops could be split at different locations or other en-route bus stops could be provided, it would help divert residents from using KF142 and KF143.

9.3 As for pedestrian flow, TD said that based on the pedestrian flow estimates made in the traffic assessment of the Development at Anderson Road and the current pedestrian surveys conducted by TD and CEDD, the total numbers of users of KF142 and KF143 were about the same, while the distribution of pedestrian flows was slightly different. After the implementation of the above improvement measures, TD would jointly review the usage of both KF142 and KF143 with relevant government departments.

9.4 Regarding the effectiveness of the provision of an additional en-route bus stop for cross harbour bus route no. 619, TD said that bus route no. 619 was a popular route in both Sze Shun Area and On Tai Area. However, in view of the fact that both Kam Tai House and Yung Tai House of On Tai Estate were relatively far from KF142, TD hoped that the provision of an en-route bus stop at Tin Wan House would enable residents of both Kam Tai House and Yung Tai House to use KF143 to get to Shun On Road for taking the no. 619 series cross harbour bus routes. Otherwise, based on the present situation, residents of both Kam Tai House and Yung Tai House could only walk to KF142 and then on to Shun On Road for taking rides. Alternatively, they might use KF143 to get to Shun On Road and then walk a rather long way to Shun Tin Bus Terminus for taking buses. TD stressed that various departments would adopt a multi-pronged approach, along with the above-mentioned lift-improvement measures, to ease the commuting problems of the residents during peak hours. In the long run, TD would, as usual, put forward the implementation of the Bus Route Planning Programme (“BRPP”) and improve the public transport services in On Tat and On Tai Areas. For instance, TD would strive to increase the frequency of route no. 613A during morning and evening hours in the first quarter of the year and enhance the frequency of route no. 290X.

10. In regard to the agenda item, Members raised follow-up views and enquiries as follows:

10.1 Mr Jimmy CHAN (i) said that TD had submitted various kinds of statistical data in the paper for this meeting, but he found that there were logical fallacies on the part

of the department. He considered it logically wrong for TD to say that students who used KF142 to reach Shun On Estate could be diverted after completion of schools and other facilities in On Tai Estate. He added that while in the long run, students would gradually no longer have to commute to schools in other districts, students currently attending schools in Shun On Estate would not transfer schools just because of the completion of new schools in On Tai Estate. Therefore, the completion of new schools would not be able to divert the current pedestrian flow effectively in the short term. It was unrealistic for TD to think that the completion of new schools could effectively divert the current pedestrian flow in a short period of time; and (ii) said that the department had not yet responded to the enquiries from the Vice-chairman and Mr PANG Chi-sang regarding the commuting surveys and statistics among residents. Members were not sure whether TD had produced statistics on the reasons for residents to use KF142 and KF143 or conducted any survey to collect the commuting data of residents, so as to support the argument that the provision of an en-route bus stop could divert the pedestrian flows of KF142 and KF143. He considered that TD's statistics could have been done more deliberately. He hoped that TD would understand the severe situation of residents queuing to use the lifts at KF142 during peak hours, and that the above-mentioned proposals to solve the problem of pedestrian flow during peak hours were not quite practical. He enquired TD whether there were other options that could more effectively solve the problem of residents queuing to use the lifts at KF142.

- 10.2 The Vice-chairman (i) criticised TD's plan to increase the frequency of route no. 613A mentioned earlier was made possible by reducing the frequencies of route nos. 213A (from On Tai to Choi Hung) and 213B (from On Tai to Kwun Tong). During the initial period of the commissioning of route nos. 213A and 213B, the Vice-chairman had already pointed out that the bus routes only provided services during morning peak hours on weekdays. The service frequencies and timetables did not match the commuting habits of residents. He requested that TD adjust the frequencies and timetables of the two routes. Although a survey conducted by TD found a lack of patronage, TD had not made frequency adjustments in the past two years. Yet, TD recommended in the meeting paper that an en-route bus stop be added at KF143, i.e. across from Tin Wan House. The Vice-chairman described the recommendation as amounting to putting the cart before the horse. He added that if route nos. 213A and 213B, which only provided morning peak hour services, were converted to full-day services, the pedestrian flow could be diverted effectively. He believed that residents would not "choose the longer route over the shorter one", and asked whether the department had listened to the voices of

residents. The Vice-chairman suggested that even if the above bus routes were not converted to full-day services, TD could also consider adjusting or increasing the service frequencies during peak hours. However, TD had never tried to adjust the service frequencies. The Vice-chairman pointed out that bus patronage had dropped significantly earlier due to the epidemic. In his view, TD's statistics at that time could not reflect the present situation, and it was unreasonable for TD to reduce the frequency of route no. 213B based on the statistical results. The Vice-chairman criticised TD for "tearing down the east wall to mend the west wall". In addition, the Vice-chairman pointed out that if the buses departed directly from Anderson and On Tai Estate, the pedestrian flow could be diverted effectively because if such an arrangement was in place, the residents would not use the lifts to reach Shun On Road to take buses at all. He urged TD to estimate the patronage of the lifts after the conversion of route nos. 213A and 213B to full-day services; and (ii) appreciated the efforts of all departments involved, hoping that the representatives of various departments would reflect Members' views to their department heads. He hoped that TD would implement measures that would genuinely benefit residents instead of doing something for the sake of doing it and "making patchy fixes". If the fare of route no. 213X, which provided full-day services, was lowered or its departure from On Tai Estate could be as frequent as every minute like route no. 27, residents would not head to Shun On Road to take buses. Therefore, he considered that TD was putting the cart before the horse. He urged TD to improve traffic arrangements at source instead of "making patchy fixes", which made TD's adjustment appear to be effective and prevented Members from criticising TD for inaction.

- 10.3 Mr PANG Chi-sang (i) reminded TD not to implement measures for the sake of implementing them, particularly referring to the second and third point of the improvement measures of the department's response. Nor should the department think that Members could not understand the BRPP. He rhetorically asked TD whether the provision of an en-route stop for the three above-mentioned bus routes at Tin Wan House in downhill direction was really effective. He added that although On Tai Estate had been completed for many years, TD had not provided an en-route stop at Tin Wan House on the ground that opposite Tin Wan House was Shun Tin Bus Terminus, which was within ten metres of the proposed bus stop. Besides, when residents got to Shun Tin Bus Terminus via KF143 during peak hours, the buses were already full at the previous stop, rendering the residents waiting at the terminus unable to get on the buses. As such, residents would naturally use KF142 to get to On Yat House of Shun On Estate, located before the terminus, for

the ease of boarding buses during peak hours. He considered TD's argument that the provision of an en-route bus stop at Tin Wan House could divert the pedestrian flow untenable, and criticised TD for having no regard for the residents.

11. The highlights of the response given by the representative of TD were as follows:

11.1 Schools to be completed near On Tai Estate included Carmel Leung Sing Tak School ("CLST"), Hong Kong Taoist Association Wun Tsuen School ("HKTAWTS") and a rehabilitation centre. CLST was originally located in Shun On Estate, while the original site of HKTAWTS was situated at On Shin Road in Kwun Tong Central. Therefore, TD was of the view that after completion of the new schools and the rehabilitation centre, the flow of people heading to Shun On Road via the lifts would be reduced.

11.2 In terms of pedestrian surveys, students accounted for about one-third of the people queueing up at KF142 for using the lifts to go to Shun On Road. In addition, some parents of primary school students also joined the queue to use the lifts, resulting in a relatively large number of people observed using the lifts at KF142. TD thanked Members for their views on the pedestrian surveys and said that it would review and improve the statistical work.

11.3 Regarding the effectiveness of the provision of an en-route bus stop for the no. 619 series cross-harbour routes in diverting the flow of KF142 users, TD stressed that the departments concerned would adopt a multi-pronged approach, along with the lift improvement measures mentioned earlier, to solve the issue of the utilisation rate of the footbridge as far as practicable. The proposed en-route bus stop opposite Tin Wan House was about 200 metres away from Shun Tin Bus Terminus, but there were hidden slopes along the way. TD opined that the provision of the en-route bus stop would make it more convenient for residents of King Tai House, Kam Tai House, and other buildings close to KF143 to take buses.

11.4 In the long run, TD planned to provide a cross-harbour bus route in the Anderson Road Quarry Development, passing through On Sau Road, On Tai Estate and On Tat Estate. The bus route was expected to meet the needs of passengers crossing the harbour during peak hours, especially those heading to Central and Western District and Wan Chai District. TD had already implemented the above-mentioned bus route under BRPP 2022-2023.

- 11.5 TD said it understood that many Members and members of the public were concerned about passengers' use of KF142 to access Shun On Road for taking buses, and that passengers hoped to have more bus routes to choose from. It had never stopped conducting reviews and strengthening the bus services in On Tai Estate and On Tat Estate. The department would continue to review the needs of passengers and enhance the bus services in On Tai Estate as much as possible.
- 11.6 TD noted Members' views on the services of route no. 213B and understood Members' concern that the statistical results might not fully reflect the actual commuting needs of residents due to the epidemic. With society's return to normalcy, students, for example, had progressively resumed whole-day face-to-face classes in February. The department would arrange for surveys to be conducted again with a view to obtaining more accurate and sufficient data.
- 11.7 For the time being, TD had no plan to reduce the frequency of route no. 213A.
- 11.8 As for the transport service connecting On Tat Estate and On Tai Estate to the Choi Hung direction, TD would introduce another bus route in the Development of Anderson Road Quarry Site in accordance with the implemented BRPP 2022-2023. The new route, which would travel to the Choi Hung and Diamond Hill area via On Tai Estate, was expected to facilitate passengers travelling along New Clear Water Bay Road to Choi Hung for interchanging to other transport modes.
- 11.9 Regarding the views on route nos. 213A and 213B, TD was aware of the great demand for transport services connecting On Tat Estate and On Tai Estate to MTR stations. At present, residents might take route nos. 213M and 213S to Lam Tin Station via Tseung Kwan O Road. The service frequencies of these two routes were relatively high. TD observed that residents were more inclined to take route nos. 213M and 213S connecting to MTR stations. Nevertheless, the department would continue to review the future development of route nos. 213A and 213B.

12. The Chairman (i) thanked the departments involved, especially CEDD for conducting multiple pedestrian surveys at the footbridges. The Chairman said that he had seen many statistical staff working at the footbridges on several occasions when passing by, commending them for providing very specific data. CEDD had conducted pedestrian surveys twice in three years. TDTC had also conducted site inspections with various departments during early morning hours. Moreover, TDTC had just learnt that TD would subsequently conduct pedestrian and vehicular surveys; (ii) from the perspective of residents, statistical data was certainly important, but the implementation of

measures was even more crucial. TDTC was looking forward to the implementation of more specific measures by TD. Although the department had earlier suggested a number of improvement measures, it was better to take a multi-pronged approach than to do nothing. But he all the more hoped that TD would listen to the views of Members, especially their views on ancillary transport facilities, such as the provision of new bus routes and an en-route bus stop, as well as their enquiries about the effectiveness of the measures in guiding pedestrians to use KF143 and thus reducing the pedestrian flow at KF142. TDTC hoped that the commuting problem of On Tai Estate residents could be solved at source, which was by strengthening the external ancillary transport facilities of their place of residence. Apart from improving bus routes, TDTC hoped that TD would further explore Members' suggestion of the provision of green minibus routes to connect to the Choi Hung or Kwun Tong MTR Stations. The Chairman hoped that an update would be available shortly; and (iii) handled the extempore motion moved by the Vice-chairman and seconded by Mr HSU Yau-wai, Mr Jimmy CHAN and Mr PANG Chi-sang. Since the extempore motion was relevant to this agenda item, the Chairman agreed that the extempore motion should be discussed and put to vote at this meeting.

13. The Vice-chairman presented the motion, which called for an expeditious study of provision of a pedestrian linkage system in On Tai (Anderson) connecting Sze Shun and Tai Sheung Tok, as well as an early implementation of the full-day services of bus route nos. 213A and 213B.

(Post-meeting note: the extempore motion had been uploaded to the KTDC website. For details, please refer to the relevant information in TDTC Paper No. 2/2023.)

14. After voting, TDTC passed the motion with 10 votes in favour, zero vote against and zero abstention.

15. The Chairman requested the Secretariat to inform the Commissioner for Transport of the contents of the motion in writing.

16. Members noted the paper.

III. Proposed Pedestrian Environment Improvement Works in Kwun Tong Business Area – Ngau Tau Kok Portion (KTDC TDTC Paper No. 3/2023)

17. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of Energizing Kowloon East Office, HyD and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (“Ove Arup”) to the meeting.

18. The representatives of HyD and Ove Arup presented the paper.
19. In regard to the agenda item, Members raised views and enquiries as follows:
 - 19.1 Mr Kevin SO (i) said that after listening to HyD’s briefing, he saw ample room for improvement in the new proposal, and raised the following enquiries: (1) what was the significance of the original proposal put forward by HyD in 2020; (2) was the department not aware that the original proposal required trench excavation; (3) whether the department considered that the design of the original proposal would not affect Lai Yip Street in the first place; and (4) whether the vehicular flow along Lai Yip Street appeared only recently. He stressed that traffic in Kwun Tong District had always been congested, and the pedestrian subway at the Ngau Tau Kok MTR Station had always been busy during peak hours. In his view, the situation in 2020 was not much different from that in 2022 and 2023. He questioned why it was only now the department had put forward the new proposal if it was indeed a good one; (ii) said that part of Elegance Road Garden would be acquired by the Drainage Services Department (“DSD”) due to the Kwun Tong Promenade Stormwater Storage Scheme. However, based on the existing meeting papers, he had no way of knowing whether the construction periods of the two projects would overlap and whether the projects would affect each other. He could only know that the proposed pedestrian subway would straddle Elegance Road Garden. Therefore, he hoped that HyD would inform Members of the situation; (iii) pointed out that Elegance Road Garden was the “green lung” of Kwun Tong District, and there were several large, old-aged trees in the garden. He said that in the previous meetings, he had expressed his hope that the departments concerned would preserve the large trees as far as practicable. Yet, HyD was currently planning to build a pedestrian subway there. Thus, he would like to enquire whether HyD would acquire Elegance Road Garden under the purview of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department. He hoped HyD would explain whether the trenchless method would be used to carry out works for the proposed pedestrian subway through the underground of the garden. He stressed that he did not want to see future conflicts between the two projects that resulted in project delays; (iv) doubted the effectiveness of the proposed pedestrian subway in diverting pedestrian flow since the new alignment required a longer detour. Even though more people were working in places that the new proposed route would pass through when compared to the past, he was not optimistic about the diversion effect of the subway on pedestrian flow; and (v) expressed anger at HyD’s remark that the proposed

pedestrian subway could divert the pedestrian flow to Kwun Tong Promenade, because after reaching Manulife Place via the subway, pedestrians would have to go back to the at-grade walkway in order to go on to the next pedestrian subway. He indicated that at present, members of the public could reach Kwun Tong Promenade directly by walking on the at-grade Ngau Tau Kok Road and Lai Yip Street, without the need to use the above “up-and-down” route. He pointed out that even if there was a lift in the pedestrian subway, it would not help. He said that the proposed new route did not have any shade shelter along the road section spanning across Hoi Bun Road Park in Kwun Tong. In addition, the works of the Kwun Tong Promenade Stormwater Storage Scheme would have to be carried out in the soccer pitch of Hoi Bun Road Park. Thus, he believed that no members of the public would use the above route. He hoped HyD would answer the above questions in detail.

19.2 Mr PANG Chi-sang indicated that based on visual estimation, the original alignment was shorter than the new one. However, HyD pointed out that the original proposal would take one year longer to complete than the new one. Therefore, he hoped that HyD would explain the reasons for the longer construction period of the original proposal. He said that according to the information in the meeting paper, the excavation length of the original proposal was apparently shorter, but it would require twice as long as the new proposal to complete. In other words, the new alignment was longer but with a shorter construction period and lower costs. He expressed incomprehension and urged HyD to explain.

20. The highlights of the response given by the representative of HyD were as follows:

20.1 Regarding the enquiries about the pedestrian flow in Ngau Tau Kok Area of Kwun Tong Business Area, HyD stated that Ove Arup had reviewed the latest development of the construction area of the proposed pedestrian subway. It was anticipated that the pedestrian flow in the area would be higher than that projected in 2020. Therefore, one of the highlights of the new proposal put forward by HyD (i.e. the new alignment planned in view of the new pedestrian flow brought by the new development of the area) was to divert the pedestrian flow in the area.

20.2 Regarding the enquiries about the works of the Stormwater Storage Scheme in Elegance Road Garden (the proposed construction of underground drainage pipes (trenchless)), HyD stated that it had maintained close liaison with DSD and was aware of the Kwun Tong Promenade Stormwater Storage Scheme. In regard to

the construction works concerned, HyD had coordinated with DSD and learnt that the pipes proposed by DSD would need to span across Kwun Tong Road. After coordination, HyD and DSD had confirmed that the two departments could use the trenchless method to complete the above two projects.

- 20.3 Regarding the convenience of the new alignment of the proposed pedestrian subway, HyD said it would still recommend building pedestrian subway S2 along the original alignment. However, at the same time, CEDD also had a project under study in Wai Yip Street, but the project scheme had yet to be finalised. HyD emphasised that it had to coordinate with CEDD in the construction of pedestrian subway S2 along the original alignment to ensure a smoother flow of the entire pedestrian linkage system. HyD understood that the new alignment required going up and down stairs and was not desirable. Nevertheless, HyD candidly admitted that the cost-effectiveness of the project had to be considered, and the land lease of Manulife Place required that it cooperate with the Government in providing connecting facilities. Therefore, the new alignment was the best option in terms of cost-effectiveness.
- 20.4 Regarding the enquiries about the difference in the construction periods for the new and old proposals, HyD advised that there was not much difference in the total length of the new and original alignments, which involved quite a number of locations. Yet, the new proposal did not require open-cut excavation at the busy junction of Kwun Tong Road and Lai Yip Street. Therefore, HyD anticipated that the overall construction period would be shortened by 12 months, adding that further investigation and detailed design were still needed to accurately estimate the time required for construction.
- 20.5 Regarding the enquiry about whether the proposed pedestrian subway could achieve a diversion effect, HyD said that some Members had inspected the usage of the footbridge at exit B of the Kowloon Bay MTR Station (“Kowloon Bay footbridge”). HyD advised that the commissioning of the footbridge had facilitated the public to cross Kwun Tong Road. HyD expected that the current proposed new alignment would have a very similar effect to the above footbridge spanning across Kwun Tong Road, whether in terms of diverting pedestrian flow or serving as an alternative alignment. Besides, in view of its function as an alternative alignment, HyD would provide barrier-free access facilities for the proposed pedestrian subway in order to meet the needs of the public. Therefore,

HyD emphasised that the project concerned should be put forward in accordance with the new proposal recommended by the department.

21. The Chairman enquired HyD about the time for proceeding to the next phase of the project. He believed that HyD should have a general grasp of the progress even though no specific timetable was available yet.

22. The representative of HyD responded that the gazetting and detailed design of the project would be carried out in the second quarter of the year. Regarding the specific implementation timetable, HyD said that the proposed pedestrian subway would mainly be used to cope with the increase in pedestrian flow caused by future development projects in the Wai Yip Street area. Therefore, HyD hoped that the project would tie in with the progress of the relevant developments, and anticipated that the pedestrian subway would be commissioned in 2030.

23. The Chairman enquired HyD whether the next phase of the project should be submitted to TDTC for reporting and discussion.

24. The representative of HyD advised that the next phase of the project did not need to be submitted to TDTC for discussion.

25. The Chairman confirmed with HyD whether the department would proceed with the procedures on its own after attending this meeting and gazetting the project.

26. The representative of HyD responded that as the Chairman said, the department would proceed with the procedures on its own after attending this meeting and gazetting the project.

27. In regard to the agenda item, Members raised follow-up views and enquiries as follows:

27.1 Mr Jimmy CHAN stated candidly that he noticed at the previous meetings that there was a lack of communication among government departments, giving the impression that they worked in their own silos. There had even been cases where Department A excavated and paved the ground and then Department B had to excavate again at the same location. In his view, HyD's failure to specify in the discussion paper the impact of the project or projects of other departments, such as the Kwun Tong Promenade Stormwater Storage Scheme, had aroused concern about the lack of communication among government departments, which might even result in the need to re-plan related projects. Therefore, he suggested that HyD mention the projects for which other departments were responsible in future

discussion papers to be submitted to TDTC, so as to prevent Members from making wrong judgement and wasting time. He advised that as other Members said, there were different new projects in Kwun Tong District, and different departments had also made suggestions, which were indeed beneficial to residents of the district. However, the purpose of discussion at District Council (“DC”) meetings was to allow Members to express their views and make enquiries. Therefore, HyD must provide sufficient content in the submitted discussion papers. He emphasised that although HyD had communicated and coordinated with DSD on relevant projects, there were inadequacies in the contents of the discussion papers. He hoped that future discussion papers submitted by HyD would be more detailed so that Members could have a clear understanding of each project.

- 27.2 Mr Kevin SO (i) advised that TDTC was only providing views based on HyD’s presentation. He pointed out that the report in 2020 was submitted to TDTC by HyD, not by other government departments. After a few years, HyD put forward an enhanced proposal, such as using the trenchless method, and considered the project concerned comparable to the Kowloon Bay footbridge. He emphasised that the Kowloon Bay footbridge was striven by KTDC on the ground that the pedestrian flow was too concentrated at a footbridge there. He added that the new alignment proposed by HyD made a relatively longer detour. Although he was not clear whether HyD could shorten the pedestrian subway between the Ngau Tau Kok MTR Station and Manulife Place in the specific design, he still hoped that HyD would consider avoiding the detour to Elegance Road Garden so as to shorten the route. He also enquired about the related technical feasibility. He pointed out that the new alignment was anticipated to be completed earlier but he was worried that its cost might be two to three times higher than that of the original alignment; (ii) said that from the diversion perspective, he supported the construction of a new pedestrian subway. However, he questioned the necessity for the new alignment to make a detour to Elegance Road Garden. In his view, the shortest distance was to walk straight across the at-grade road. If members of the public needed to make a detour before using a pedestrian subway, it remained uncertain whether the public would be willing to use the proposed pedestrian subway; and (iii) expressed doubts about whether wheelchair users could use the barrier-free facilities of the proposed subway. He stressed his hope that the proposed pedestrian subway would truly be a barrier-free access without any obstacles, such as stairs, upon completion. He had such concerns because of the uneven terrain between the Ngau Tau Kok MTR Station and Manulife Place. He reiterated his hope that wheelchair users would

not encounter any obstacles in using the proposed pedestrian subway after its commissioning.

27.3 Mr PANG Chi-sang (i) clarified that HyD might have misunderstood his first round of questions. As the original alignment was shorter than the new one, he originally wanted to ask why the construction period of the latter could be reduced by one year. He believed that HyD had already answered his question. However, he stressed that he did not misunderstand HyD's presentation; (ii) did not have strong opinion on the new alignment if its construction cost did not increase significantly. However, HyD did not explain whether it would, like DSD, acquire part of Elegance Road Garden for carrying out construction works; and (iii) pointed out that there was no connection point for the proposed pedestrian subway at Ting On Street. Therefore, he would like to enquire whether HyD would add an exit at Ting On Street for the pedestrian subway as he opined that it could facilitate public access to the pedestrian subway in future.

28. The highlights of the response given by the representative of HyD were as follows:

28.1 Regarding the design constraints on the new alignment of the proposed pedestrian subway, HyD explained that there were the MTR Kwun Tong Line viaduct and Kai Fuk Road Flyover at the site. HyD had conducted inspection and found that there were many piles blocking the site, making it impossible for the alignment of the pedestrian subway to pass straight through. HyD had no choice but to design the new alignment with a winding route through the gaps between the piles. Besides, HyD admitted that the pedestrian subway was indeed rather circuitous in terms of perception by pedestrians. Nevertheless, the new alignment was mainly used to cope with the development needs in the west of Lai Yip Street. From the perspective of pedestrians, there was not much difference in the total length of the new and original alignments. Either route only took about a three-minute walk from the Ngau Tau Kok MTR Station to Manulife Place. Therefore, HyD believed that members of the public would use the new alignment to get to the commercial buildings in the west of Lai Yip Street.

28.2 Regarding the suggestion to provide a pedestrian subway exit at Ting On Street, HyD said it had no intention to provide an exit at Ting On Street at the moment but the need could be reviewed again.

29. Mr PANG Chi-sang reiterated that DSD needed to acquire part of Elegance Road Garden for

trenchless works. He enquired whether HyD also had to do likewise.

30. The representative of HyD said it had to build shafts in Elegance Road Garden for trenchless works and therefore had to acquire part of the garden. The department added that it had been coordinating with DSD on the location for building shafts.

31. Members raised no objection and noted the project.

**IV. Elevator System between Kai Tin Road and Lei Yue Mun Road - Investigation, Design and Construction
(KTDC TDTC Paper No. 4/2023)**

32. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of HyD and Mannings (Asia) Consultants Limited (“the Consultant”) to the meeting.

33. The representatives of HyD and the Consultant presented the paper.

34. In regard to the agenda item, Members raised views and enquiries as follows:

- 34.1 Mr KAN Ming-tung (i) said that Members serving Lam Tin Area had been looking forward to the project for a long time. He advised that as the population began to age more than a decade ago, many residents had asked why a lift could not be retrofitted at exit A of the Lam Tin MTR Station to connect to the station. Residents were perhaps not fully aware of the issue when they were young. However, as residents aged and wheelchair users were on the rise, they would increasingly realise the necessity of lifts. Members serving Lam Tin Area had tried their best to look for ways to seek a location for retrofitting the lifts. The intended location was, however, obstructed by the enclosed design of the podium of Sceneway Garden, making it impossible to retrofit a lift there. After a decade of efforts to continually apply for various funding schemes, there was finally sufficient funding from one of the schemes to retrofit a lift system that would facilitate the commuting of over ten thousand residents of the five constituencies in the uphill areas of Lam Tin. He was pleased with today’s results and understood the difficulties involved in the project. He hoped that HyD would continue to strive for breakthroughs, overcome obstacles and keep abreast of the progress; and (ii) added that HyD had conducted multiple consultations and revised the proposal many times, taking in many different views. He further put forward the following

views: (1) installation of a security system in the proposed pedestrian subway, such as an emergency bell and closed circuit television; (2) as regards the design of the exit at Kai Tin Road, he expected that HyD would had proper discussions with staff responsible for the Kai Tin Road improvement works to prevent the failure to widen the road after completion of the lift; (3) provision of a proper ventilation system; and (4) paying attention to the noise level of the works and reducing its impact on nearby residents.

34.2 Mr Wilson OR (i) described the project as “appearing after repeated calls and urging”, saying that as a member of the Lam Tin area, he had been urging the Government to work on the proper provision of barrier-free access facilities in the district. Despite its “inherent and acquired weaknesses”, the district was able to score such achievements, which was indeed a good thing showing that HyD had been making effort to push forward the project. He recalled that on the first day of Lunar New Year five years ago, a government department representative called him to ask whether he would support the project concerned, and he replied that he did. Five years had passed since then, and he was gratified to see such an achievement today; (ii) was concerned about the geological survey mentioned in the paper. The survey commenced in September 2022 and was expected to be completed in mid-2023. He enquired about the timetable or roadmap for the subsequent phases of the project. He added that the Government had been criticised for the fact that its projects often took nearly a decade to bear fruits; fortunately, the new government cared about people’s livelihood and pushed ahead with the project to enhance pedestrian connectivity in the district, which would benefit the 130 000 residents of Lam Tin. As the project was closely related to people’s livelihood, Lam Tin residents were very concerned about the project timetable; (iii) was concerned about the project cost, he recalled that the then Financial Secretary set aside \$8 billion for 18 districts in 2018 in response to public demands for more district facilities; he asked whether, according to HyD’s estimates, the project was anticipated to experience cost overruns or insufficient funding. In his view, DC Members, as representatives to monitor the Government, must be aware of the project cost; (iv) expected the engineering team would enhance the transparency of the project. He emphasised that “more meetings could reduce misunderstanding; more communication could lead to success”. It was hoped that HyD would keep it in mind. He expressed satisfaction with the past work of HyD, but hoped that HyD would interact more with Members on the project progress so that they could provide more information to stakeholders and residents, particularly the residents of Lei On Court; (v) suggested that HyD and

the Consultant should consider the ventilation and security arrangements for the design. Citing the construction of a subway in Kai Tak at Choi Hung Road as an example, he said that when building the subway, CEDD insisted that the subway would be well-ventilated. But in fact, the ventilation there was poor at present; as for security, he said that CEDD had also claimed that there was no need to install closed-circuit television and the pedestrian environment was safe. However, current data from the police showed that various unpredictable situations had occurred in the subway. Therefore, it was hoped that HyD would think more from the perspectives of users; and (vi) hoped that the project would be launched as soon as possible to benefit people with special needs and enhance the connectivity in the district.

34.3 Mr LUI Tung-hai (i) said that he started serving as a DC Member in 2003. The then DC had already put forward this project. After more than a decade, the proposal could finally be implemented in recent years. However, he considered the progress of the project too slow and unsatisfactory. The project was passed in September 2021, but one year and three months later, HyD had still not taken action. He hoped that HyD would speed up the progress; (ii) was concerned about the capacity of the lifts. In previous meetings, he had demanded that HyD increase the capacity of the lifts. He pointed out that if a lift could only carry seven to eight persons at a time, residents would have to wait for a long time to take the lift; (iii) urged HyD to properly design the pedestrian subway connecting to the lifts, with particular attention to ventilation, safety, comfort and other arrangements; and (iv) to strengthen communication with residents of nearby housing courts/estates, such as Lei On Court, and stakeholders.

34.4 The Vice-chairman (i) was happy for the residents of Lam Tin Area, saying that there were shopping malls, escalators and lifts in the area, and the new addition of a pedestrian subway equipped with lifts, thus genuinely realising the concept of the “Universal Accessibility” Programme. Even though the process was lengthy, Members and residents could see hope, and witnessed the Government’s step-by-step implementation of the Programme; and (ii) regarding the \$8 billion earmarked by the then Financial Secretary in 2018, he asked whether HyD could apply its experience in building the lift system connecting Kai Tin Road and Lei Yue Mun Road to Anderson. The height of the lift at Kai Tin Road was more or less the same as that of the lift tower at Anderson. Their only difference was that when the population aged, many elderly in the latter would still have to use stairs to go up and down, but this would not happen in the former. He enquired whether Kwun

Tong District Office, HyD and TD could actively study the feasibility of establishing a pedestrian connection system at Anderson. Otherwise, it would run counter to the Government's vision if the elderly in Anderson had to queue up for a long time to use the lifts.

35. The highlights of the response given by the representative of HyD were as follows:

- 35.1 The project was aimed at providing a barrier-free pedestrian access to connect Kai Tin Road and Lei Yue Mun Road.
- 35.2 HyD understood Members' concerns over security, ventilation and comfort level. It would give careful consideration to the relevant arrangements. HyD said that the current preliminary design had already included a surveillance system, and it would discuss with the police the detailed arrangements for the installation of closed-circuit television.
- 35.3 Regarding communication with stakeholders, HyD had been communicating with the representatives of the Lei On Court Owners' Corporation to learn about the views and concerns of the residents. HyD understood that part of the project would occupy some space in the court, and construction works would be carried out within the court. From the perspective of the residents, the works would have an impact on them after all. Therefore, HyD would maintain close communication with the residents and minimise the adverse impact of the project as far as practicable. In addition, after completion of the project, the same access would be used as the project's access for maintenance and the emergency access of Lei On Court, which would involve issues such as the land lease and the building's deed of mutual covenant. Hence, there were still many details to be discussed with Lei On Court, and HyD would maintain communication with the residents.
- 35.4 Regarding the project cost, the engineering team was currently conducting a geological survey. Due to the relatively complex project design, the proximity of the project site to residential areas, the environmental and space constraints, coupled with the need to build the pedestrian subway, the engineering team would have to decide the subway design and construction method based on the information from the geological survey. In view of these uncertainties, HyD was unable to provide detailed information on the project cost, but would adopt the most cost-effective design option.

35.5 The capacity of a lift had been increased from 15 persons as planned in the preliminary feasibility study proposal to 18 persons, which was sufficient to cope with the estimated pedestrian flow.

35.6 As for the construction period, as the geological survey was still in progress, the design and construction method would not be decided until after the results of the geological survey were obtained. According to the preliminary estimation by the engineering team, the project would take about four years. However, the commencement date had not yet been confirmed as the project involved a host of uncertainties, such as the modification of the land lease and arrangements for the shared access as the maintenance access after completion of the project and the emergency access of Lei On Court, as well as the gazetting of the project and handling of relevant objecting comments. Nevertheless, the engineering team would endeavour to complete the project as soon as possible.

36. In regard to the agenda item, Members raised follow-up views and enquiries as follows:

36.1 Mr Wilson OR (i) expressed his understanding of HyD's considerations in responding to the enquiries about the roadmap and timetable for the project. He pointed out that given the project "appeared after repeated calls and urging", taking a decade from proposal to design, he hoped that HyD and the Consultant would carefully review and shorten the project procedures in the next four years. He added that from a user's perspective, even one day of delay in completing the project was still unsatisfactory. Nevertheless, he understood that HyD had worked very hard, and he was not "nitpicking". The main reason why he raised this question was that HyD had anticipated uncertainties about the timing of various project procedures. Though understanding that every project had the above problems, he hoped that HyD and the Consultant would listen to his views by reviewing again and shortening the procedures for the entire project. Lastly, he added that he hoped the project would be completed in four years; and (ii) asked about the project cost, and opined that HyD could not do without setting a base cost. As a taxpayer, he was very concerned about whether public funds were well spent, and hoped that HyD would disclose relevant information.

37. The highlights of the response given by the representative of HyD were as follows:

37.1 HyD would, after the meeting, review the project procedures with relevant departments, such as studying ways to shorten the approval procedures for projects

involving alteration works carried out in existing private buildings. In addition, the project involved the alteration of existing drains, and the drains would be returned to Lei On Court after alternation. HyD would discuss the relevant arrangements with Lei On Court as soon as possible.

37.2 As for the project cost, HyD would provide supplementary information after the meeting.

38. Members noted the paper.

V. **Members and Area Committees' Views on Public Transport Services and Road Works Projects in Kwun Tong District**
(KTDC TDTC Paper No. 5/2023)

39. Members noted the paper.

VI. **Progress Report on Road Projects in Kwun Tong District**
(KTDC TDTC Paper No. 6/2023)

40. In regard to the agenda item, Members raised views and enquiries as follows:

40.1 Mr HSU Yau-wai (i) enquired about the progress of the bus shelter installation works at Oi Tat House, On Sau Road. He said that TD listed the installation progress as the same in the meeting papers for this and the last meeting. Both papers indicated that there was an underground pedestrian subway underneath the original bus stop, therefore the Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited (“KMB”) had to study whether there were other feasible sites nearby for the installation. Thus, he enquired when the results of the above-mentioned study would be available; and (ii) asked about the progress of the installation of seats and a display panel for the bus stop at Yan Tat House, On Sau Road. In view of KMB’s plan to install seats at the bus stop there, he enquired about the anticipated completion date of the installation. In addition, regarding the problem of failure to install the display panel due to a lack of power supply at the above site, he asked whether the department would solve the power supply problem.

40.2 The Vice-chairman enquired about the completion date of the traffic light outside Kam Tai House on On Sau Road since the project concerned was not listed in the paper.

40.3 The Chairman enquired about the waiting time for the installation of bus shelters, seats and display panels listed as “to be installed” in the progress report. The Chairman said that the shelter of the bus stop at Cheerful Court on Choi Ha Road in his constituency had been listed as “to be installed” for four years without any progress. He pointed out that according to the paper, “TD was following up with KMB on the installation arrangements”, but such status had been maintained for the past four years. Unless TD had actually not followed up with KMB on the installation works for the past four years, the status quo should not be always maintained. The Chairman said that there were still facilities at many bus stops, such as the ones at Sau Lok House on Sau Ming Road, Kai Yip Estate on Wang Chiu Road, and Oi Tat House on On Sau Road, that had been listed as “to be installed”. In his view, TD should step up expectation management and specify the progress instead of vaguely stating “to be installed”.

41. The highlights of the response given by the representative of TD were as follows:

41.1 Regarding the bus stop at Oi Tat House on On Sau Road, a bus shelter could not be installed due to an underground pedestrian walkway. TD would continue to follow up with KMB.

41.2 Regarding the problem of failure to install the display panel due to a lack of power supply for the bus stop at Yan Tat House on On Sau Road, TD would find out more about the relevant arrangements with KMB, especially time-sensitive information, and would report to Members prior to the next meeting.

41.3 Regarding the bus stop shelter at Cheerful Court on Choi Ha Road pending installation, according to TD’s latest information, the application had been approved. To TD’s understanding, KMB hoped to complete the installation by the end of this year.

42. The representative of HyD responded to the progress of the construction of the pedestrian crossing at On Sau Road, saying the investigation works for the project had been completed earlier. HyD had also informed the organisation concerned of the need to arrange for underground utilities diversion, and the organisation was currently preparing for preliminary work relating to utilities

improvement. The utilities improvement works involved trench excavation and backfilling and was expected to take six to nine months to complete. After completion of the utilities diversion, HyD could commence the traffic light works. It would continue to update the Vice-chairman on the progress of utilities diversion and related works for the project.

43. In regard to the agenda item, Members raised follow-up views and enquiries as follows:

43.1 The Vice-chairman said that road safety was very important, adding that with the easing of the epidemic, it was believed that there would be more and more pedestrians and vehicles on the road. Therefore, he suggested that TD or the police should take measures similar to the installation of temporary traffic signs at the pedestrian crossing in On Tat Estate, and put up warnings or reminders at the pedestrian crossings on On Yan Street near Ming Tai House and outside Wo Tai House to remind road users to pay attention to road safety.

43.2 The Chairman (i) hoped that TD would include the timetable for the installation of bus shelters, seats, and display panels in the meeting paper for the next meeting; and (ii) enquired why the application for provision of a shelter for the bus stop at Cheerful Court on Choi Ha Road had not been approved during the four years of review.

44. The highlights of the response given by the representative of TD were as follows:

44.1 Regarding the application for provision of a shelter for the bus stop at Cheerful Court on Choi Ha Road not being approved, TD would provide additional information to Members after the meeting.

44.2 As for the suggestion of posting road safety warnings or reminders at the pedestrian crossings on On Yan Street near Ming Tai House and On Sau Road near Kam Tai House, TD would review the traffic conditions at the locations with the police. If necessary, TD would work with the police to consider appropriate management measures.

45. Members noted the paper.

VII. List and Timetable of Major Traffic Improvement Works Completed, Being Implemented or Planned by the Transport Department / Highways Department in the Last Two Months
(KTDC TDTC Paper No. 7/2023)

46. In regard to the agenda item, Members raised views and enquiries as follows:

46.1 Mr HSU Yau-wai (i) said that the traffic lights at On Chui Street went into service on 12 January. He thanked the department for its efforts in completing the final stage of the works even it was two days before Lunar New Year's Day; (ii) asked when the existing plastic railings at the above-mentioned pedestrian crossing would be replaced by iron railings; (iii) enquired why the works of item no. 12 of the paper (the underground investigation works for provision of on-street parking spaces for motorcycles at On Chui Street) was delayed from January to March; and (iv) enquired whether item no. 18 of the paper (the underground investigation works for provision of on-street parking spaces at On Chui Street) would be carried out in March as scheduled.

46.2 The Chairman enquired about the reasons for the delay in the works of item nos. 2 to 14 (save item no. 11) of the paper.

47. The highlights of the response given by the representative of HyD were as follows:

47.1 As regards the installation of iron railings for the traffic lights at On Chui Street, the demolition works at the original pedestrian crossing had been substantially completed. The iron railings were expected to be installed in February.

47.2 Regarding item nos. 12 and 18 of the paper (the underground investigation works for provision of on-street car and motorcycle parking spaces at On Chui Street), HyD had discussed with the contractor to arrange for both of the above underground investigation works to be carried out simultaneously. Both works were expected to be completed at the same time between March and May.

47.3 As for the deferral of the commencement dates of some projects, HyD explained that there were many reasons involved, such as delays caused by contractors and procedural delays. HyD understood that delays were unsatisfactory and would endeavour to catch up with the progress so as to complete the projects on the expected completion dates.

48. The Chairman made follow-up enquiries as follows: (i) enquired about the reason for the two-month delay in the commencement of the project for provision of 18 on-street motorcycle parking spaces at Sau Ming Road near Sau Ming Road Park, and asked whether HyD was confident that the project could be commissioned in May as scheduled; (ii) enquired about the reason for the four-month delay in the commencement of the underground investigation works for provision of eight on-street motorcycle parking spaces at Ka Wing Street; and (iii) enquired about the reason for the one-month delay in the commencement of the underground investigation works for the extension of the bus bay at Choi Fook Estate. He added that the project was proposed one and a half years ago.

49. The highlights of the response given by the representative of HyD were as follows:

49.1 Concerning provision of 18 on-street motorcycle parking spaces at Sau Ming Road near Sau Ming Road Park, HyD said that the project involved converting the existing motorcycle parking spaces into a footpath and marking the adjacent road for provision of 18 on-street motorcycle parking spaces. Since the project contractor encountered problems in applying for the implementation of temporary traffic arrangements, the project commencement date was deferred. Nevertheless, HyD was confident that the above parking spaces could be open for use in May as scheduled, and would continue to monitor the contractor's work.

49.2 As regards the underground investigation works for the extension of the bus bay at Choi Fook Estate, the works had been scheduled to commence immediately after Lunar New Year. HyD was confident that the above project would be completed in February.

49.3 Regarding the delays in the commencement and completion dates of the underground investigation works for provision of eight on-street motorcycle parking spaces at Ka Wing Street, HyD understood that the situation was unsatisfactory. Generally speaking, even if the commencement date of an individual project was deferred, HyD would still require the contractor to complete the project in accordance with the anticipated completion date. In view of the delays in both the commencement and the completion dates of the above project, HyD would require the contractor to devote more resources to the project for its early completion.

50. The Chairman made a follow-up enquiry about when HyD discovered that the contractor had delayed the project at Ka Wing Street. He pointed out that while the contractor failed to start

the works as planned in November last year, HyD allowed the contractor to delay the commencement of the works for four months until March this year. He wondered how HyD monitored the contractor's work during those four months, and how it would follow up on the delay. The Chairman considered that HyD should have been advised of the delay in the commencement of the project in November, the very beginning of the delay period, and should have followed up on the issue, instead of only finding out a quarter later about the contractor's deferral of the project commencement date.

51. The representative of HyD responded that the department would make enquiries to its relevant staff members, follow up on the actual status of the one-quarter delay in the commencement of the project at Ka Wing Street, and require the contractor to complete the project as soon as possible. In addition, HyD would appropriately reflect the issue of the contractor's delays in the individual project in its performance report.

52. Members noted the paper.

VIII. Any Other Business

53. Members raised no other discussion items.

IX. Date of Next Meeting

54. The next meeting was scheduled to be held at 9:30 a.m. on 28 March 2023 (Tuesday).

55. The meeting was adjourned at 11:41 a.m.

The minutes of the meeting were confirmed on 28 March 2023.

Kwun Tong District Council Secretariat
February 2023